



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,590	08/25/2003	Ricky W. Purcell	1443.053US1	4252

21186 7590 04/12/2006

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH  
121 S. 8TH STREET  
SUITE 1600  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

ROANE, AARON F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3739

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/648,590	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PURCELL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Aaron Roane	<b>Art Unit</b> 3739	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,10-12,14-16,29-31,34 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,10-12,14-16,29-31,34 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 6, 7, 10-12, 14-16, 29-31, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Independent claims 6 and 12 refer to either a “fibrous sheet-like layer” and/or ~~“~~“sheet-like” fibrous material. The examiner has combed through the specification trying to verify support for such a recitation, but can find no such evidence/support. In addition to the lack of written support, all of the figures show the same perspective or view orientation (this perspective could be a side view) and do not lend themselves to even implying support for anything “sheet-like” made from a fibrous material. Had Applicant disclosed different views of the device, e.g., side views, top views and front views, the different perspectives may have offered support to the “sheet-like” recitation.

R. W. J.

Art Unit: 3739

In order to provide an examination, the examiner interprets both a “fibrous sheet-like layer” and/or s “sheet-like” fibrous material as simply a –fibrous layer—and/or a –fibrous material’, both of which have been previously rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 7, 10-12, 14-16, 29-31, 33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunshee et al. (USPN 4,462,224) in view of Sabin (USPN 6,099,555) in view of Avery (USPN 5,486,206).

Regarding claims 6 and 12, Dunshee et al. disclose a hot/cold pack comprising: an enclosure (10); a solute within said enclosure (21), a liquid within said enclosure (19); a membrane segregating said liquid from said solute (24 of the group of 24 and 26), wherein rupturing said membrane mixes said liquid with said solute to produce an endothermic solution within said enclosure; and an absorbent core (23) within said

Art Unit: 3739

enclosure, said membrane (26 of the group of 24 and 26) segregating said absorbent core from said solute, see col. 2, lines 26-58, col. 3, line 18 through col. 5, line 65 and figures 1-7, particularly figures 1-3. Dunshee et al. fail to disclose that the endothermic solution is spread through the absorbent core and that the absorbent core is formed at least partially of a fibrous material. Sabin discloses a cold pack (1) comprising: an enclosure (entire outer covering consisting of 2 and 2a), a powdered solute (24) within said enclosure; a liquid (28) within said enclosure, a membrane (portion of 2 and 2a located at 7) segregating said liquid from said powdered solute, wherein rupturing said membrane mixes said liquid with said powdered solute to produce an endothermic solution within said enclosure, and an absorbent core (26 of 8) within said enclosure, said absorbent core retaining said endothermic solution to spread said endothermic solution throughout said enclosure. Sabin further discloses that the absorbent core (26 of 8) is an absorbent layer. Finally, Sabin discloses solute is interspersed throughout said absorbent layer before said membrane is ruptured, see col. 1-11, particularly col. 10, lines 2-24 and figures 2 and 3. Additionally, it should be noted that the mixture of 24, 26 and 28 forms a gel, since 26 is a gelling agent. Additionally, Sabin teaches that the liquid, solute and gelling agent can all be mixed together such that the mixture is an endothermic gel. Avery discloses a therapeutic thermal device comprising a gel (20) and teaches providing the gel with a fibrous material (e.g., 66) in order to increase gel viscosity and heat capacity, see abstract, col. 1-6 and figures 1-5. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Dunshee et al., as taught by Sabin, to mix the liquid (solvent), solute and gelling agent together as an

Art Unit: 3739

alternate cooling modality and in order to provide a relatively conformable cooling device, and as further taught by Avery, to provide the gel with a fibrous material in order to increase gel viscosity and heat capacity.

Regarding claims 7, 10, 11, 14-16, 31 and 33, Dunshee et al. in view of Sabin in further view of Avery disclose the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 29, 30 and 36, Dunshee et al. disclose the claimed invention, see col. 5, lines 4 and 19.

Regarding claim 34, Dunshee et al. in view of Sabin in further view of Avery disclose the claimed invention.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 1/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner will address each argument/remark in turn.

Applicant offers/provides no arguments traversing the rejection. However, Applicant does state that in a telephone interview dated 1/24/2006 the examiner "indicated that the amended claims appear overcome the pending rejection but indicated that further searching and reconsideration would be required." However, the examiner distinctly recalls telling Applicant

Art Unit: 3739

that the examiner would not even characterize the proposed amendments as “appearing” to overcome the prior art. Additionally, the examiner pointed out the importance of having evidence/support in the specification for any and all amendments made to the claims. As noted above, the examiner could find no evidence/support, whether it be written word or drawing, of the amended subject matter.

**This action is made FINAL.**

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3739

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Roane whose telephone number is (571) 272-4771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.R. *A.R.*  
April 6, 2006

*Roy D. Gibson*  
ROY D. GIBSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER